



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,875	07/25/2003	Francine R. Chen	A3053-US-NP XERZ 2 01564	1845
61962 7590 02/19/2008 FAY SHARPE / XEROX - PARC 1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE SUITE 700 CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER PONIKIEWSKI, TOMASZ	
			ART UNIT 2165	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/626,875

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Tomasz Ponikiewski

Art Unit

2165

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, 60-88.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see note.
12. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 1/21/08
13. ☐ Other: _____.

continuation of 11:

As to applicant's argument that Sundaresan et al. does not teach source of the identified stories is found not persuasive. Sundaresan et al. teaches in column 6, lines 48-49 that web pages and identified by URL and come from web sites (column 6, lines 65-68) that are associated with particular internet domain name, and include the content of a particular organization.

As to applicant's argument that Pirololi et al. does not teach determining vector as per limitation of claim 1 is found not persuasive. The examiner combined the Sundaresan et al. and Pirololi et al. references wherein Sundaresan et al. teaches source (as pointed in previous argument) wherein the particular organization could be cnn, nbs etc. therefore the broadest interpretation of the limitation is covered by combining references.

As to applicant's argument that Sundaresan et al. does not teach determining link label information is found not persuasive. Classifying documents into a categories means that the documents in a particular directory are linked by similarity of terms or concepts etc.

As to applicant's argument that Maybury does not teach indicating of existence of stories linked to the same event is found not persuasive. Maybury describes teaches a system that finds interrelated stories using segmentation in column 19, lines 33-38.

As to claim 77 Brown does describe transformation by removing stopwords from the text. As to verified and unverified the specification paragraphs 0115 and 0116 of instant application are confusing to interpret. The specification seems to point to translating a story using "trusted" translation and the parts of the text that are not transformed are then used for second transformation. The claimed limitation seems to direct to two separate transformations of the same text. The specification also gives exemplary transformation in paragraph 0035 as being "performed manually several time until a certain result is agreed as correct". As such the process seems to be performed by a person, which cannot be patented.



CHRISTIAN CHACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100